DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 540 SO 017 474

AUTHOR Ross, E. Wayne; Hannay, Lynne M.
TITLE Practicing Critical Theory in Social Studies Preservice Education: Reconsidering the Role of Reflective Inquiry.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Thinking; Educational Strategies; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Social Studies; Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John); *Reflective Teaching; *Reflective Thinking

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the paper is to examine potential reasons for the lack of influence that reflective inquiry has had on social studies theory and to suggest an alternative perspective. The first two sections of the paper discuss the reasons for reflective inquiry's failure to impact on practice and include: (1) the interpretation of the inquiry model itself, which entails contradicting conceptions of Dewey's model such as the technical/procedural approach that has become rarefied with the steps of inquiry themselves emphasized over the process; and (2) the generally traditional practices of preservice teacher education, which hinge on the premise that teacher educators, while advocating reflective inquiry, do not practice this approach by example and do not furnish a laboratory where such practice is modeled, experienced, and reflected upon. The third section of the paper advocates the need to adopt a critical theory perspective in social studies education by exploring what a preservice program based on a critical theory of education might contain, emphasize, and encourage. Three strategies of critical discourse (focusing on the social construction of knowledge and the nature of social life; emphasizing analytical skills instead of technical proficiency; and highlighting generic theories of teaching with an examination of personal theories of action resulting from beliefs and past experiences) and implications for teacher education are discussed. The paper concludes that proper preservice courses can be translated into good teaching practices. A three-page list of references is included. (TRS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273540

PRACTICING CRITICAL THEORY IN SOCIAL STUDIES PRESERVICE EDUCATION: RECONSIDERING THE ROLE OF REFLECTIVE INQUIRY

E. Wayne Ross
The Ohio State University

Lynne M. Hannay
The Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education

Paper Presentation
at the
Annual Meeting
of the
American Education Research Association
San Francisco
1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wayne Ross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 017 474

"...since the general or prevailing opinion on any object is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied."
John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, 1859

PRACTICING CRITICAL THEORY IN SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION: RECONSIDERING THE ROLE OF REFLECTIVE INQUIRY

Reflective inquiry has been promoted for many years as a progressive and effective method of teaching the social studies. The term reflective inquiry is used in social studies to describe a process that involves: decision-making in a socio-political context; identification of problems; the search for satisfactory answers; and the investigation of social problems as realized in the lives of individuals (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977). John Dewey's (1933) theory of reflective thinking serves as the primary source from which this methodology has grown. The influence of Dewey's model on curriculum and instruction in the social studies has been momentous. Over the years the reflective approach to teaching has also been advocated by many in addition to Dewey, including Griffin (1942), Bode (1940), Hunt & Metcalf (1955), Johnson (1956), Hullfish & Smith (1960), Engle (1960) and Beyer (1971).

However, although reflective inquiry has impacted on social studies theory it remains questionable whether this impact has been translated into educational practice. The purpose of this paper is to examine potential reasons for this lack of influence and to suggest an alternative perspective. The first two sections of the paper discuss the reasons advanced for the failure to impact on practice. They include: the interpretation of the inquiry model itself and the generally traditional practices of teacher education. The third section of the paper will advocate the need to adopt a critical theory perspective in social studies education.

Historical Overview

Several historical analysis of curriculum theorizing in the social studies have been conducted (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; Stanley, 1981; and Osborne, 1984). One common feature in each of these analysis is the inclusion of reflective thinking, inquiry or critical thinking as a significant movement or rationale for teaching the social studies. John Dewey proposed a theory of reflective thinking in 1909 with the writing of How We Think. Reflective thinking as a rationale for teaching the social studies was first developed by the N.E.A. Committee on the Social Studies in 1916 when it called for students to participate in critical thinking instead of recitation, drilling, and memorizing. The Committee called for students to follow a process of (1) identifying facts from their life experiences, (2) gathering other facts through investigation, (3) using their reasoning powers to form conclusions, and (4) submitting their conclusions to criticism (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

In 1933, Dewey restated his theory of reflective thinking in a new edition of How We Think. In this restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process, Dewey sought to present his theory with "increased definitiveness and clearness of statement", therefore making it more accessible and useable for the classroom teacher. In the now famous Chapter VII, Dewey presented his analysis of reflective thinking, identifying "the essential functions of reflective activity." Reflective activity, according to Dewey, involves the states of thinking that occur following a "perplexed, troubled, or confused situation at the beginning" (pre-reflective situation) and prior to "a cleared-up, unified, resolved situation at the close" (post-reflective situation). In Dewey's theory, reflective thought occurs within these limits and includes the following "phases" or "aspects",

(1) **suggestions**, in which the mind leaps forward to a possible solution; (2) an intellectualization of the difficulty or perplexity that has been **felt** (directly experienced) into a **problem** to be solved, a question for which the answer must be sought; (3) the use of one suggestion after another as leading idea, or **hypothesis**, to initiate and guide observation and other operations in collection of factual material; (4) the mental elaboration of the idea or suppositions as an idea or supposition (**reasoning**, in the sense in which reasoning is a part, not the whole, of inference); and (5) testing the hypothesis by overt or imaginative action. (Dewey, 1933, p. 107)

In the 1940's and 1950's, Dewey's theory of reflective thinking was extended. Boyd Bode (1940) published How We Learn. Earl Johnson's book Theory and Practice in the Social Studies sought to produce a synthesis of Dewey and Bode's ideas. Maurice Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf in Teaching High School Social Studies (1955) provided an important integration of the method of reflective thinking and the teaching of social studies by proposing their "closed areas" approach.

During the 1960's and 1970's much of the work in social studies education was heavily influenced by Bruner's notion of the structure of the disciplines. What came to be known as the "new social studies" dominated the scene. However, the notion of reflective inquiry as conceived in previous works was able to survive. In 1960, Shirley Engle wrote an article entitled, "Decision Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction". In this article, a rationale similar to the one produced by the N.E.A. 1916 Committee and John Dewey's theory of reflective thinking was suggested. Beyer's Inquiry in the Social Studies Classroom (1971) and Richard Phillip's Teaching for Thinking in High School Social Studies (1974) both identified the paramount concern of social studies to be the creation of intellectually independent individuals through the use of critical and reflective thinking.

The Reflective Inquiry Model

As we have seen, over the years Dewey's theory of reflective thought and the pedagogy it inspired was restated again and again by a long line of educators and has in fact taken a revered place among theories of learning and teaching. Reflective inquiry has the makings of what should be an extremely useful and popular teaching strategy. Yet, in spite of widespread endorsement of reflective inquiry, especially

by social studies educators, classroom teachers use this teaching strategy rarely, if ever, relying instead upon pedagogical approaches that many times stifle inquiry and critical thinking (Shaver, Davis & Helburn, 1979; Ross, 1984).

Reflective inquiry as currently conceived is based on the premise that social issues and problems can be critically examined by applying a technical model of problem-solving. Recent presentations of the reflective inquiry pedagogy have transformed the phases or aspects of reflective thought, as described by Dewey, into a highly structured problem-solving procedure (Beyer, 1979, 1984a; 1984b). This technical problem-solving procedure is presented to students in a detailed, step-by-step manner and students are encouraged to approach problem-solving tasks using this linear procedure. Beyer identifies the major stumbling-block in the effective use of reflective inquiry pedagogy to be insufficient proceduralization. Beyer (1984a; 1984b) advises that thinking skills can be improved through precise definition of the skills to be taught, providing explicit or "step-by-step instructions" on how to use specific thinking skills, and the most crucial part of teaching thinking skills, according to Beyer, is the discussion of its operational procedures.

This technical/procedural approach to problem-solving and reflective thinking leads to the rarefication of the "steps" of reflective thinking identified by Dewey. The proceduralization advocated by Beyer appears contrary to the flexibility advocated by Dewey:

> The five phases, terminals, or functions of thought, that we have noted do not follow one another in a set order. On the contrary, each step in genuine thinking does something to perfect the formation of a suggestion and promote the location and definition of the problem. Each improvement in the idea leads to new observations that yield new facts or data and help the mind judge more accurately the relevancy of facts already at hand. (Dewey, 1933, 115-116)

Not only does the proceduralization of reflective thinking contradict the conception of Dewey, but as Paul (1984) points out, a technical approach to thinking is narrowly reductionistic and fails to call attention to the logic of dialectical issues. Paul argues that the technical approach to thinking, as represented by the

work of Beyer, is an inappropriate method of fostering truly reflective or critical thinking by students. First, not recognizing the difference between problems of a technical nature and problems of a dialectical nature creates a tendency to reduce all problems to the technical level. This is a crucial point, especially for social studies educators because as Paul notes, "To the extent that a problem about humans is rendered **technical** it is reduced to a relatively narrow system of exclusionary ideas; technical precision and manageability are achieved by excluding a variety of other technical and nontechnical features" (1984, p. 10). Secondly, in the social studies and the humanities there are a variety of alternative systems or competing viewpoints. Within this context, the issues under investigation are properly understood as dialectical, that is calling for dialogical reasoning not technical reasoning. Dialogical reasoning is described by Paul as,

> ...thinking critically and reciprocally within opposing points of view. This ability to move up and back between contradictory lines of reasoning, using each to critically cross-examine the other, is not characteristic of the technical mind. Technical knowledge is typically developed by restriction to one frame of reference, to one standpoint. Knowledge arrived at dialectically, in contrast, is like the verdict, with supporting reasoning, of a jury. There is no fail-safe path to it. There are at least two points of view to entertain. It is not, as problem-solving theorists tend to characterize all problems, a movement from an initial state through a series of transformations (or operations) to a final (answering) state. (1984, p. 10)

A third criticism of the technical approach to reflective or critical thinking is that dialectic thinking cannot, by its very nature, be reduced to an operational procedure. "When we think dialectically we are guided by **principles**, not **procedures**, and the application of the principle is often subject to discussion or debate (Paul, 1984, p. 11). The most important and significant real life problems are not easily categorized. These problems span many disciplines, contain a multitude of variables, and the moral, intellectual, and affective factors at play are not easily isolated -- the solution to these problems are not to be found in the structure of a discipline or a procedure. As Paul notes, the "neat and abstract procedures of technical reasoning" have no place in the solution of these problems. When confronted with

social problems, the most effective reasoning is dialogical.

> What is called for is dialogic, point-counter point, argument for and argument against, scrutiny of individual event against the background of this or that global "totalizing" of it into one's life. What is called for is liberating emancipatory reason the ability to reason across, between, and beyond the neatly marshalled data of any given technical domain. Because it cannot presuppose or restrict itself to any one system or technical language or procedure, it must be dialectical. That is, it must move back and forth between opposing points of view. (Paul, 1984, p. 11)

The proceduralization of the process of inquiry and the technical approach to teaching thinking skills in combination with the epistemological beliefs that social knowledge is non-problematic produce passivity and a lack of skepticism in the social studies classroom. Consequently, critical interpretation is removed from social studies classrooms. This results from the application of positivistic norms and ideology in the search for truth. The way in which this search and its results are portrayed in the social studies classroom (i.e., the technical or "scientific" approach to inquiry) creates an atmosphere that encourages the objectification of social phenomena. Social processes and institutions become immune from critical examination and therefore are accepted as "value free" or as "unchangeable". This uncritical stance tends to reinforce and reproduce the status quo.

An example may help to clarify the discussion. In the course of a ninth grade civics class, the students confront an important community issue--the homeless. The students identify this issue as a problem and begin to inquire into how the problem might be solved. Using the technical/procedural approach to inquiry that is being promoted, the chances are very high that any course of action decided upon by the students will involve using existing governmental or community organizations to solve the problem. This in and of itself is not inappropriate. The point here is that students have confronted an important, indeed, crucial social problem, without examining the crux of the problem -- how these people came to be homeless. The students are looking for answers to a problem by relying on the system and institutions that created the problem in the first place. In this situation problem-

solving occurs without the risk of upsetting the status quo. Social problems are investigated without critique of the social context.

Teacher Education

University based social studies educators have called for inquiry based instruction as the most beneficial means of teaching citizenship and critical thinking skills. However as previously mentioned, research evidence suggests that this mode of teaching has not yet made great in-roads into the average social studies classroom (Goodlad, 1984; Shaver, Davis, Helburn, 1979; Traugh, 1978). One reason, advanced in the previous section, concerns the proceduralization of the reflective inquiry model. The practices of teacher education might provide the second link in this implementation failure. Typically, university educators have placed the blame on teachers and the restraints of the public school system. Yet is this assumption totally valid? It still must be be questioned: from whence does pedagogical change cometh; and what role does preservice education play in the possibility of change?

Recently, several scholars have maintained that the university plays a minute role in changing pedagogical practices of schools (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). This is contrary to the usual argument that the socialization of the schools overcomes the liberalism advocated by the university. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) challenge this assumption, claiming that, "The liberal view of the college can only be substantiated by looking at its rhetoric and by ignoring its practice." This paper concurs with that statement, and places the blame partially on preservice educational practices. Possibly, the problem with changing the typical expository nature of schools does not rest only with the public school system, but is supported through mainline traditional pedagogical practices of preservice education.

It remains questionable whether the academics who preach the value of inquiry instruction, practice inquiry instruction in their university classrooms. Often preservice students are introduced to the inquiry approach in rather traditional expository classrooms. In an empirical study, Raths and Katz (1982) found little

congruence between the methods advocated and those used by social study methods instructors. They conclude:

> ...if teacher educators use primarily lecture and discussion techniques in advancing their goals, techniques with doubtful effectiveness in the acquisition of skills and methods, there can be little surprise that teacher education courses are seen as weak in impact. (p. 280)

It is not surprising that social studies preservice teachers begin their teaching careers by reverting to a content and lecture approach practiced by their university teachers rather than the inquiry approach advocated by their university teachers.

Inquiry instruction, then, might form the content orientation of the preservice social studies methods course but does not form the experiential base of such a course. Students often encounter the reflective inquiry model as content to be memorized for an up-coming examination rather than as a process used to solve real problems. The proceduralism of the inquiry model is emphasized rather than the philosophical assumptions underlying reflective inquiry.

Further, even when reflective inquiry is employed within a university classroom, the subject of the inquiry process must be considered. Zeichner and Teitelbaum (1982), suggest that there is a long history of efforts promoting critical or inquiry-based teacher education (Salzillo and Van Fleet, 1977; Bagenstos, 1975; Joyce, 1972; Strickler, 1966; Joyce and Harrotunian, 1964; Stratemeyer, 1956; Corey, 1953). All of these proposals sought to develop some form of "reflectiveness" in teachers, but as Zeichner and Teitelbaum point out, "inquiry skills have frequently been taught in teacher education in relation to teaching, but not in relation to the educational and social contexts in which teaching is embedded" (p. 103).

If inquiry is used to clinically investigate social issues similar to the homeless example used in the preceding section, then the approach remains detached and perhaps not applicable to everyday problems. Issues of direct concern to preservice social studies teachers must become the focus. For example, topics that concern educational practices and that make those practices problematic would appear

to be far more appropriate. The school must be perceived as an apparatus of the super-structure with the charge of perpetuating hegemony. This awareness appears crucial if change is to occur. Fullan and Park, (1981), for instance, have emphasized the role of beliefs in blocking successful implementation of innovations. If reflective inquiry was employed to assist preservice teachers in examining their beliefs regarding teaching and learning, typical traditional practices might become problematic. Fuller and Bown (1975) suggest that preservice teachers are very concerned with helping their students learn. Through a critical examination of how learning occurs and students experience with reflective inquiry, it might be possible to influence the beliefs of the involved preservice teachers. By helping these preservice students critically question taken-for-granted procedural knowledge regarding teaching, there is an enhanced possibility of change.

A critical investigation of typical social studies content employing the Deweynian concepts of reflective inquiry seems especially crucial in the social studies because this subject area is directly concerned with cultural reproduction. As Osborne (1984) suggests, "Given its citizenship mission, social studies, more than any other subject in the curriculum, is a vehicle for ideological hegemony" (p. 106). Therefore, it would appear that preservice social studies education must address the issues underlying both the social and educational system in order to raise the awareness of the involved students. Knowledge must be viewed as constructed and must be critically evaluated as to potential learning outcomes. Pre-service students must be encouraged to reflect on the knowledge and skills overtly and covertly perpetuated through such taken-for-granted facets of everyday school life as textbooks, school organization, student tasks, or interaction patterns (Hannay, 1984).

Consequently, preservice social studies education must be concerned with the content advanced and the methodology employed in social studies methods courses. If social studies educators accept the often quoted Deweynian notion that students learn by doing, then it would seem questionable whether preservice social studies teachers

are learning the inquiry model in methods courses. By experience, these preservice teachers have not acquired the skills necessary to work through the process themselves, let alone teach others those skills. Indeed as Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) suggest, these students are learning that:

> Being a teacher, then, means identifying knowledge that is certain, breaking it into manageable bits, and transmitting it to students in an efficient fashion. Being a student means acquiring this knowledge and learning how to use it in a context which does not include criticism and has little patience with analysis.

While de-crying the practices of the public school system, the methods instructors are employing similar techniques. The passivity questioned in the public school system, therefore, might not differ from the passivity of university classrooms. Interestingly, the reasons teachers advanced for not using the inquiry method (Traugh, 1978) are congruent with those advanced by social studies methods instructors as reasons for not using inquiry instruction (Raths & Katz, 1982).

If change is to occur, reflective thinking must become a taken for granted lens through which preservice teachers conceptualize their practice. The goal of pre-service social studies education, therefore, must be to influence the personal practical knowledge of prospective teachers in order to facilitate a re-formation of what teaching means. Clandinin and Connelly (1984) suggest that image might provide a useful lens through which to understand how personal practical knowledge operates:

> ...image, for us, is a kind of knowledge, embodied in a person and connected with the individual's past, present and future. Image draws both the present and future into a personally meaningful nexus of experience focused on the immediate situation which called it forth. It reaches into the past gathering up experiential threads meaningfully connected to the present. And it reaches intentionally into the future and creates new meaningfully connected threads as situations are experienced, and new situations anticipated from the perspective of the image. (Clandinin & Connelly, 1984, p. 3)

Consequently, if reflective inquiry is to be incorporated into the preservice teachers' belief system it must become the image through which the teacher views teaching. Theoretical knowledge and experience in using this approach must be included in the preservice social studies curriculum.

We return to the initial question: from whence cometh pedagogical change? If university instructors, while overtly advocating reflective inquiry, model passive and expository instructional techniques, then how can change be facilitated? Rather than being a link in a continuing chain of passivity, the university should provide an interactive and critical model of pedagogy. However, such involvement and lack of passivity is not developed through teaching by lecture/discussion technique; it occurs through experience in doing. Students must practice inquiry skills in order to internalize an image of reflective teaching and consequently employ these approaches in their classrooms. In other words, this approach to teaching must become the normal way of conceptualizing practice rather than something used in university to satisfy the instructor and pass examinations. The university classroom must become the venue for not only advocating reflective inquiry but must become a laboratory where such practices are modeled, experienced, and reflected upon.

The Role of Critical Theory

In the previous sections, the model of reflective inquiry and the practices of preservice social studies teacher education have been examined. It was argued that the technical/procedural model was intended originally to serve as a guide for inquiry, but has become rarefied with the steps of inquiry themselves emphasized over the process. Moreover teacher educators, while advocating reflective inquiry, might not practice this approach. The following section will explore what a preservice social studies program, based on a critical theory of education might contain, emphasize, and encourage.

The primary question to be addressed in the following paragraphs is, "What is a critical theory of education and how might it affect teacher education?" Critical theories have a special role as guides for human action in that they are aimed at providing enlightenment and emancipation for the people that hold them (Geuss, 1981). A critical theory of education attempts to provide enlightenment by enabling individuals to discover insights into the nature of social life (Newmann, 1985). It

is also particularly concerned with the conflict between the dominant interests of the society and the autonomy of individuals and organizations. In addition to attempting to provide enlightenment regarding the nature of social life, the purpose of education from a critical theory perspective is to emancipate "all people such that none are subject to domination or exploitation by others economically, politically, sexually, intellectually, or spiritually" (Newmann, 1985, p. 4).

The curriculum and instructional strategies of a program based upon a critical theory of education seek to realize the goals of enlightenment and emancipation through three basic strategies: (a) social knowledge, (b) practical skills, and (c) critical discourse (Newmann, 1985). First, the curriculum of such a program emphasizes knowledge about the nature of social life, including the significance of dominant interests of the society, resistance to the dominant interests, and the social construction of knowledge. The curriculum development process is decentralized thus responding to the needs of the community of which the students and teachers are members. Inquiry into issues such as homelessness mentioned above, is an example of how the curriculum may respond to local circumstances.

The second strategy used to meet the goals of a critical theory of education is an emphasis on practical skills regarding literacy, numeracy, communication and thinking. A critical theory of education emphasizes basic academic tasks, but they are enhanced by a focus on analytical understandings. Practical skills, such as critical thinking skills, are mastered for the purpose of gaining enlightenment and emancipation. For example, a model of reflective inquiry grounded in critical theory emphasizes the application of principles, not just procedures, in the investigation of social issues. A critical approach encourages the development of a critically reflective state of mind, rather than just the application of a set of steps or skills to a problem. Van Mannen (1977) calls this "critical reflectivity" and describes it as being a level of thought that incorporates the consideration of moral and ethical criteria, in addition to reflective thinking procedures.

Development of critical reflectivity requires a new type of discourse in the classroom — critical discourse. This is the third strategy for realizing the goals of a critical theory of education. Critical discourse requires that the unexamined practices and beliefs of teachers and students be subjected to scrutiny and a continuous process of revision. Expert knowledge as well as taken-for-granted beliefs or common sense are also subjected to critique.

These three strategies for the realization of the enlightenment and emancipation have several implications for teacher education. First, by focusing on the social construction of knowledge and the nature of social life, a critical theory requires that teacher education be sensitive to the social context of teaching and learning as well as to its methods. The complex issues of schooling and society, including hegemony, power, and cultural reproduction, must be included in preservice curricula.

Secondly, by emphasizing analytical understanding instead of technical proficiency in the use of practical skills, critical theory is able to address the weaknesses of current approaches to reflective thinking. A critical theory perspective distinguishes between "reflective thinking skills" and "reflective thinking." Reflective thinking skills are isolated intellectual functions such as distinguishing between verifiable facts and value claims, recognizing logical inconsistencies in a line of reasoning, distinguishing between warranted and unwarranted claims, determining the reliability of a claim or source, etc. While these skills are certainly important, mastery of them does not necessarily produce a reflective thinker. Technical proficiency is to be highly valued, but not as an end in itself. To train someone to think reflectively means to train them to expose their thinking to others, to open themselves to criticism, from there peers as well as from authority. In scholarly circles this is insisted upon, because it is known that individual thinking, no matter how "skilled," is subject to distortions of all kinds, "from mere ignorance to 'bad faith'" (Sabini & Silver, 1985). It is important that this distinction be made when preparing teachers to use reflective methods of

teaching and to foster reflective thinking in their own students.

The third and most important implication of a critical theory of education has for teacher education concerns the development of critical discourse. Traditionally, generic theories of teaching and learning provide the foundation of the teacher preparation curriculum. It is expected that prospective teachers become familiar with generic theories and then once faced with classroom realities make the appropriate applications of these theories. Personal theories of action, based upon past experiences and reflections are not usually acknowledged by teacher educators as legitimate sources of knowledge about teaching and learning. Critical discourse requires that the focus on generic theories of teaching be supplemented by the examination of personal theories of action that result from the beliefs and past experiences of both teacher educators and preservice teachers. Guides for action in teaching, therefore, are not the result of exclusive adherence to generic theories, but the result of past experiences and reflections in light of existing generic theories. A critical theory goal of teacher education is to nurture the development of preservice teachers' personal theories of action and their images of teaching.

Success in achieving the goals of a critical theory of education, requires not only the appropriate methods or strategies, but also the appropriate attitudes. Dewey notes that the reflective thinking cannot be achieved through the application of skilled methods alone, but also requires the appropriate attitudes. Reflective thinking includes thinking carried out by someone not only skilled in the process of inquiry but someone that possesses the attitudes of "openmindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness" as defined by Dewey (1933). Good thinking, according to Dewey, results from the union of skilled methods and the appropriate attitudes. Because of their importance to Dewey's theory a brief review of the attitudes follows. First, openmindedness refers to "an active desire to listen to more sides than one; to give heed to facts from whatever source they come; to give full attention to alternative possibilities; to recognize the possibility of error even in the beliefs that are

dearest to us" (Dewey, 1933, p. 30). As Zeichner and Teitelbaum point out, this attitude requires an appraisal of rationales that underlie what is ordinarily taken for granted. Secondly, the attitude of responsibility refers to being intellectually responsible, by considering the consequences of one's actions and being willing to "adopt these consequences when they follow reasonably from any positions already taken" (Dewey, 1933, p. 32). The final attitude described by Dewey is wholeheartedness. This attitude refers to a genuine enthusiasm, where the attitudes of responsibility and openmindedness are at the center of the person's life. Dewey defined reflective action as "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further consequences to which it leads" (p. 9). For Dewey, as noted previously, reflection was more than merely the five phases of thought. The value of reflective thought is that it:

> ... emancipates us from merely impulsive and merely routine activity. Put in positive terms, thinking enables us to direct our activities with foresight and to plan according to end-in-view, or purposes of which we are aware. It enables us to act in deliberate and intentional fashion to attain future objects or to come into command of what is now distant and lacking (Dewey, 1933, p. 17).

If Dewey's perception of reflective inquiry is removed from the bounds imposed by the proceduralization evident in the inquiry literature, then the facets described above are not incongruent with a critical theory of education. The role of instruction in teacher education then becomes empowering preservice teachers by providing an environment that exemplifies inquiry social studies instruction and classroom interaction. Generally, social studies methods and foundation courses would have to provide a milieu supportive of reflective inquiry with the goal of making the taken-for-granted problematic. Pre-service students would be encouraged and supported to apply Dewey's concepts of openmindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness to their study of education. In this, they would observe and critically reflect upon theory and practice.

A social studies education program that integrates Dewey's concept of reflection and a critical theory of education would require changes in content and pedagogy that have been long established. The program implications might include the use of ethnographic studies which provide students with the opportunity to make a connection between their daily routine during field experiences and the complex issues of schooling and society (Gitlin & Teitelbaum, 1983; Zeichner and Teitelbaum, 1982). This means that the traditional expectations of field experiences and the content of methods classes must be transformed into experiences that provide students with the tools to make this connection. Introduction to action research techniques, to methods of observation, to interviewing, and to introspection are some possibilities. Foundation courses would have to provide a milieu supportive of reflection. A teacher education program based upon the dual foundations of the Deweyian notion of reflection and a critical theory of education would attempt to assist preservice teachers in the development of personal theories of action that would allow them to become reflective of educational practices and their context. Greene (1978) has eloquently stated the goal of such a program:

> The concern of teacher educators must remain normative, critical, and even social order. Neither colleges nor schools can legislate democracy. But something can be done to empower teachers to reflect upon their own life situations, to speak out in their own ways about the lacks that must be repaired; the possibilities to be acted upon in the name of what they deem decent, humane, and just. (1978, p. 71)

Conclusion

Implementing reflective inquiry based in critical theory is not the panacea to the problems faced in the social studies. But, a preservice social studies program based on reflective inquiry is a good start to addressing the general concerns with social studies education. As it was noted earlier by Shaver et al. (1979), one reason why alternative methods of instruction are not used more often by teachers is because of their lack of experience with them as students and as classroom leaders. This point needs to be taken to heart by instructors in social studies methods

courses. If we are to expect teachers to use discursive and critical methods in their classrooms, then social studies methods course instructors must begin to teach by example. Through such preservice courses, and hopefully inservice education, eventually the goals of reflective teaching, so long an underlying thrust in the theoretical social studies literature, might actually be translated into practice.

As teacher educators we must be willing to consider the radical reconstruction of teacher education and the social studies. It will take the combined cooperation of teacher educators, institutions, and classroom teachers to integrate the ideal of critical thinking and reflective inquiry into the everyday world of teaching and teacher education. Surely, the ultimate goal is worth the effort?

References

Bagenstos, N. (1975). The teacher as inquirer. Educational Forum, 39, 231-237.

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). Defining the social studies. Washington, D. C.: The National Council for the Social Studies.

Beyer, B. (1971). Inquiry in the social studies. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Beyer, B. (1984a). Improving thinking skills--defining the problem. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(7), 486-490.

Beyer, B. (1984b). Improving thinking skills--practical approaches. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(8), 556-560.

Bode, B. (1940). How we learn. New York: Heath.

Bruner, J. (1960). The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, M. (1984). Teachers' personal practical knowledge: image and narrative unity. Unpublished paper, University of Calgary and O.I.S.E..

Corey, S. (1953). Action research to improve school practices. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Engle, S. (1960). Decision-making: The heart of the social studies. Social Education, 24(7), 301-309.

Fullan, M. & Park, P. (1981). Curriculum implementation. Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Fuller, F. & Bown, O. (1975). On becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (ed.), Teacher Education, the 74th NSSE Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Geuss, R. (1981). The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gitlin, A. & Teitelbaum, K. (1983). Linking theory and practice: the use of ethnographic methodology by prospective teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, (9) 3, 225-234.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school, McGraw Hill: New York.

Greene, M. (1978). The matter of mystification: Teacher education in unquiet times. In Landscapes of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, A. (1942). A philosophic approach to subject-matter preparation of teachers of history. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Hannay, L. (1984). Cultural reproduction via the hidden curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Hunt, M. & Metcalf, L. (1955). Teaching high school social studies. New York: Harper & Row.

Hullfish, H. & Smith, P. (1961). Reflective thinking: The method of education. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co.

Johnson, E. (1956). Theory and practice in the social studies. New York: Macmillan.

Joyce, B. (1972). The teacher innovator: A program for preparing educators. In B. Joyce and M. Weil (eds.), Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Joyce, B. & Harrotunian, B. (1964). Teaching as problem solving. Journal of Teacher Education, 15, 420-427.

Newmann, F. M. (1985). The radical perspective on the social studies: A synthesis and critique. Theory and Research in Social Education, 8(1), 1-18.

Osborne, K. (1984). A consummation devoutly wished: social studies and general curriculum theory. In D. Roberts & J. Fritz (Eds.), Curriculum Canada V. (pp. 85-122). Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, University of British Columbia.

Paul, R. (1984). Critical thinking: Fundamental to education for a free society. Educational Leadership, 42(1), 4-14.

Phillips, R. (1974). Teaching for thinking in high school social studies. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Raths, J. & Katz, L. (1982). The best of intentions for the education of teachers. The Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(3), 275-283.

Ross, W. (1984). Critical teaching and learning in the social studies. A paper presented at the Sixth Conference on Curriculum Theory and Practice, Dayton, Ohio.

Sabini, J. & Silvery, M. (1985). Critical thinking and obedience to authority. National Forum, 65(1), 13-17.

Salzillo, F. & Van Fleet, A. (1977). Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 27-31.

Shaver, J., Davis, O., & Helburn, S. (1979). The status of social studies education: impressions from three NSF studies. Social Education, (2), 150-153.

Shermis, S. & Barth, J. (1982). Teaching for passive citizenship: a critique of philosophical assumptions. Theory and Research in social Education, 10(4), 17-37.

Stanley, W. (1981a). The radical reconstructionist rationale for social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 8(4), 55-79.

Stanley, W. (1981b). Toward a reconstruction of social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 9(1), 67-89.

Stratemeyer, F. (1956). Issues and problems in teacher education. In D. Cottrell (ed.), Teacher Education for a Free People. Oneonta, NY: AACTE.

Strickler, R. (1966). The student of teaching: A concept and a concern. Journal of Teacher Education, 17, 426-429.

Traugh, C. (1978). The inquiry method: how it influences teacher attitudes and behaviors. The Social Studies, 69(4), 150-155.

van Mannen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum Inquiry, 6, 205-228.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K. & Tabachnick, R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K. & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(2), 98-117.